

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 19, 2005. Claims 1 to 45 are in the application, of which Claims 1 and 40 are the only independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Office Action entered a constructive election of Claims 1 to 45, and withdrew newly-submitted Claims 46 to 52 from further consideration on the merits. Claims 46 to 52 have consequently been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of the constructive election.

The Office Action maintained its art-based rejections of Claims 1 to 45, and additionally made those rejections final. Thus, Claims 1 to 6, 8, 9, 11 to 17, 23, 24, 37, 38, 44 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,784,702 (Greenstein) in view of U.S. Patent 5,696,701 (Burgess); Claims 7, 10 and 39 were rejected further in view of Official Notice taken at page 12 of the Office Action; Claims 18 to 20, 22, 25, 27 to 31 and 35 were rejected further in view of U.S. Patent 6,125,390 (Touboul); Claims 21 and 26 were rejected further in view of Official Notice taken at page 17 of the Office Action; and Claims 32 to 34, 36 and 40 to 43 were rejected further in view of Touboul and U.S. Patent 6,167,567 (Chiles).

The rejections are all respectfully traversed, as detailed more fully below.

The invention concerns deletion or reallocation, via a network, of functional modules or hardware resources in a multifunction network device. According to the

PLEASE ENTER UPON APPEAL
Round 1/6/05